

**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**

Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)  
sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)  
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com  
Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)  
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com  
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)  
tracygao@quinnemanuel.com  
Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com  
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington D.C., 20005  
Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

*Counsel for Defendant Google LLC*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION**

CHASOM BROWN, et al., on behalf of  
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**GOOGLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL JOINT STATUS  
REPORT PURSUANT TO DKT. NO. 830**

Referral: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

PATRICK CALHOUN, et al., on behalf of  
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-05146-YGR-SVK

**GOOGLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL JOINT STATUS  
REPORT PURSUANT TO DKT. NO. 960**

Referral: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) respectfully seeks to seal certain portions of the Joint Status Report Pursuant to *Brown* Dkt. 830 and *Calhoun* Dkt. 960 (“Status Report”) filed in both cases, which contains non-public, highly sensitive and confidential business information that could affect Google’s competitive standing and may expose Google to increased security risks if publicly disclosed, including details related to Google’s internal projects, internal data sources, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics, which Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google’s competitors. This information is highly confidential and should be protected.

This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in the Status Report:

Document	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming Confidentiality
Joint Status Report Pursuant to <i>Brown</i> Dkt. No. 830; Joint Status Report Pursuant to <i>Calhoun</i> Dkt. No. 960	Highlighted Portions at:  Pages 1:11-12, 1:14, 1:23, 1:25, 1:28, 2:1-3, 2:5-6, 2:9-10, 2:13-15, 2:18-19, 2:24, 3:5-9, 3:12, 3:19, 4:3-6, 4:8, 4:16, 4:27, 5:2, 5:13, 5:27, 6:13-14, 6:16-22, 6:24-28, 7:1-2, 7:7, 7:9, 7:12	Google
Exhibit 1 to Trebicka Declaration – Jan. 10, 2023 <i>Brown</i> Hearing Transcript	Highlighted Portions at:  Pages 7:15-16, 8:9-10, 8:18, 8:21-22, 9:2-3, 9:5, 9:25, 12:5, 12:18, 12:25, 13:4, 15:16-18, 15:25, 16:8, 16:11-12, 17:6, 17:8, 18:6-10, 18:13-16, 18:18, 19:17-18, 20:11, 21:23-24, 22:25, 26:10, 28:10, 28:21-22, 29:1-2, 29:4-7, 29:10-11, 29:16, 30:4, 31:23, 34:22-24, 35:19, 35:22-23, 35:25	Google
Exhibit 2 to Trebicka Declaration – Jan. 26, 2023 Letter to <i>Brown</i> and <i>Calhoun</i>	Highlighted Portions at:  Pages 1-6	Google
Exhibit 3 to Trebicka Declaration – Jan. 28, 2023 Letter to <i>Brown</i> and <i>Calhoun</i>	Highlighted Portions at:  Pages 1-2	Google

Exhibit 4 to Trebicka Declaration – Jan. 30, 2023 Letter to <i>Brown</i> and <i>Calhoun</i>	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1-4	Google
Trebicka Exhibit 5 – Jan. 10, 2023 <i>Calhoun</i> Hearing Transcript	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 5:25, 6:2, 6:4, 6:13, 8:1, 8:3, 17:11, 18:20, 18:25, 19:1-2, 21:1, 21:22, 22:21, 25:5, 25:17, 25:20, 25:23, 26:4, 26:8-10, 26:16-17, 28:1	Google
Trebicka Exhibit 6 – Jan. 23, 2023 correspondence	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1, 3-4	Google

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

A party seeking to seal material must “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.*

In the context of dispositive motions, materials may be sealed in the Ninth Circuit upon a showing that there are “compelling reasons” to seal the information. *See Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). However, a party seeking to seal information in a non-dispositive motion, such as the underlying motion here, must show only “good cause.” *Id.* at 1179-80. The rationale for the lower standard with respect to non-dispositive motions is that “the public has less of a need for access to court records attached only to non-dispositive motions because these documents are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action” and that as a result “[t]he public policies that support the right of access to dispositive motions, and related materials, do not apply with equal force to non-dispositive materials.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179; *see also TVIIM, LLC v. McAfee, Inc.*, 2015 WL 5116721, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2015) (“Records attached to non-dispositive motions are not subject to the strong presumption of access.”) (citation omitted). Under the “good cause” standard, courts will seal statements reporting on a company’s users, sales, investments, or other information that is ordinarily kept secret for competitive purposes. *See Hanginout, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 2014 WL 1234499, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. Mar.

24, 2014); *Nitride Semiconductors Co. v. RayVio Corp.*, 2018 WL 10701873, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2018) (granting motion to seal “[c]onfidential and proprietary information regarding [Defendant]’s products” under “good cause” standard) (van Keulen, J.). Although the materials that Google seeks to seal here easily meet the higher “compelling reasons” standard, the Court need only consider whether these materials meet the lower “good cause” standard.

### III. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS SHOULD ALL BE SEALED

Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 589-99 (1978). Good cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that “contain[] confidential information about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public disclosure could harm [the party] by disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6986068, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that could harm a litigant’s competitive standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons” standard. *See e.g., Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v. Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015) (information “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’ standard where that information could be used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”) (citation omitted). Courts in this district have also determined that motions to seal may be granted as to potential trade secrets. *See, e.g. United Tactical Sys., LLC v. Real Action Paintball, Inc.*, 2015 WL 295584, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2015) (rejecting argument against sealing “that [the party] ha[s] not shown that the substance of the information . . . amounts to a trade secret”).

Here, the Status Report contains confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not share publicly. Specifically, this information provides details related to Google’s internal projects, internal data sources, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics. Such information reveals Google’s internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services while complying with its legal and privacy obligations.

Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google’s competitive standing it has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of Google’s proprietary systems, strategies, and designs to Google’s competitors. That alone is a proper basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02329-BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google’s motion to seal certain sensitive business information related to Google’s processes and policies to ensure the integrity and security of a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-02787-WHO, Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because “disclosure would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have”); *Trotsky v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at \*8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting motion to seal as to “internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publicly available”).

Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to compromise Google’s data logging infrastructure. Google would be placed at an increased risk of cyber security threats. *See, e.g., In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing “material concern[ing] how users’ interactions with the Gmail system affects how messages are transmitted” because if made public, it “could lead to a breach in the security of the Gmail system”). The security threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified information.

The information Google seeks to redact, including information related to Google’s internal projects and data logging systems, and internal metrics, is the minimal amount of information needed to protect its internal systems and operations from being exposed to not only its competitors but also to nefarious actors who may improperly seek access to and disrupt these systems and operations. The “good cause” rather than the “compelling reasons” standard should apply but under either standard, Google’s sealing request is warranted.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should seal the identified portions of the Status Report.

1 DATED: January 31, 2023

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP

2 By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

3 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
4 Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com  
5 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
6 Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
7 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

8 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
9 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
10 Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)  
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com  
11 Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)  
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com  
12 Maria Hayrapetian (CA Bar No. 315797)  
mariehayrapetian@quinnemanuel.com  
13 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
14 Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
15 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

16 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
17 Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)  
sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com  
18 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
19 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
20 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

21 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
22 Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)  
tracygao@quinnemanuel.com  
23 Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com  
24 1300 I Street NW, Suite 900  
25 Washington D.C., 20005  
Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
26 Facsimile: (202) 538-8100  
27

28 Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)

1 jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
2 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
3 New York, NY 10010  
4 Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
5 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

6 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
7 jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com  
8 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111  
10 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
11 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

12 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28